DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 043 HE 004 365

TITLE	Higher Education Facilities Commissions: A Self-Study of Operational Patterns and State Plan Criteria.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education Facilities Commissions. Committee on Administration and State Plans.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	76p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Administration; *Higher Education; *Operations Research; Questionnaires; State Programs; *State Surveys; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

This document investigates operational patterns and state plan criteria of the Higher Education Facilities Commission. Four study procedures were delineated: (1) development of a list of common responsibilities inherent for state facilities commissions in related federal legislation, (2) development of a calendar of important date related to the partnership between state and federal government, (3) development of an analysis of the various state designated responsibilities delegated to agencies with chief executive officers, eligible for the Association, (4) development of a summary of the unique state plan criteria and techniques and to report supportive rationale as indicated by state utilizing unique criteria. An analysis of state designated responsibilities of facilities commissions, a summary of unique Title 1 state plan criteria and techniques, and a summary of unique Title IV-A state plan criteria and techniques are included. The appendix includes the questionnaire designed to describe the operational framework of the various state facilities commission. (MJM)

Higher Education Facilities Commissions

ED 080043

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Self-Study of Operational Patterns and State Plan Criteria

Prepared by: Committee on Administration and State Plans
for the Association of Executive Directors of
Higher Education Facilities Commissions

HE 004 365

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 080043

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSIONS

A SELF-STUDY OF OPERATIONAL PATTERNS AND STATE PLAN CRITERIA

PREPARED BY: COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION AND STATE PLANS
FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSIONS

Spring, 1972

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSIONS:

A SELF-STUDY OF OPERATIONAL PATTERNS
AND STATE PLAN CRITERIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION TO STUDY	1
	Evolution of Study Purpose of Study Assumptions Activities and Procedures	
II.	OBJECTIVES AND FUNCTIONS DELEGATED TO FACILITIES COMMISSIONS	4
	Functions	
	Title I Title VI-A Comprehensive Planning Title III Excess Property Higher Education General Information Survey	
III.	CALENDAR OF IMPORTANT DATES RELATED TO AGENCY OPERATION	9
	(not completed, recommendation only)	
IV.	ANALYSIS OF STATE DESIGNATED RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACILITIES COMMISSIONS	10
V.	SUMMARY OF UNIQUE TITLE I STATE PLAN CRITERIA AND TECHNIQUES	15
VI.	SUMMARY OF UNIQUE TITLE VI-A STATE PLAN CRITERIA AND TECHNIQUES	38
	APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE	

FOREWORD

The membership in the National Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education Facilities Commissions and the supporting state level staffs has evolved as a rather diverse group. Obviously people defy narrow categorization, but it appeared safe to say the responding group included people who basically viewed themselves in such categories as: (1) public administrators, (2) professional educators, (3) statisticians, or (4) other. Increasing the complexity of assuring a meaningful study result was the amount of attention and time given to related problems by Executive Directors of the various state commissions. This continuum ranged from full-time involvement to an occasional signature or trip related to the agency.

The members of the Committee on Administration and State Plans fully recognized the limitations inherent within any committee process and specifically recognized the responsibility for direction the study has taken. Another major limitation was the geographic location of the membership which magnified the difficulties of close communication within the committee and the constituencies of the membership.

Despite the limitations cited, the development of this report has been enjoyable and educational to those participating. As Chairman of the Committee on Administration and State Plans, I would like to thank the participating committee members. A particularly gratifying aspect of this study was almost total response to the basic questionnaire. Special credit and thanks are due to Mr. Henry Whitcomb for his interest and work on the agency functions portion of this report, and to Dr. John M. Bogert of the Tennessee staff who took full responsibility for the chapter on Title VI-A.

George M. Roberts
Chairman

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

Evolution of Study

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 included provisions for states to determine priority uses of undergraduate academic construction funds allocated to the states. Each state or territory was required to designate a broadly representative group or Commission to study and approve an administrative plan which was to serve a referee function among the various project requests submitted at a given time. The delegation of responsibility for determining priority was supported by allocation of administrative funds for such purposes.

As states began fully staffing these agencies, and as delegation of responsibilities for other purposes increased, the Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education Facilities Commissions was formed with general purposes of facilitating exchange of ideas, better organized efforts regarding imputs on regulatory language pertaining to programs administered, and efforts toward improvement and professionalization of Commissions' staffs. During the history of the Association, committees have been selected each fiscal year to serve specified functions deemed important by the Association.

During fiscal year 1972 a Committee on Administration and State Plans was given the general assignment of assuring Association involvement in development of regulations or any other actions affecting Commission responsibilities. Another major responsibility given to the Committee included development of materials which would facilitate exchange of administrative ideas. Basically, materials were to be developed which would assist staff members in further professionalization by introduction of some ideas for local evaluation of state plans and staff roles.

Within the parameters outlined in the last paragraph, and by further narrowing the study area by recognition of responsibilities of other currently operating committees under the direction of the Association, the following study was undertaken.

Purpose of Study

The central purpose of this study was to facilitate exchange of ideas and techniques related to authoring and administering state plans which are the designated responsibilities of state commissions. Another major purpose of this study was to develop a version of responsibilities deemed common to all state-designated agencies with membership in the Association of Executive Directors of Facilities Commissions.

Other purposes assumed included development of a description of the scope of responsibility assigned to member agencies, and to simplify the reporting procedure to the Office of Education. In order to carry out the procedures above, the following specific activities were delineated:

(1) Development of a list of common responsibilities inherent for state facilities commissions in related federal legislation.

(2) Development of a calendar of important dates related to the partnership between state and federal government.

(3) Development of an analysis of the various state-designated responsibilities delegated to agencies with chief executive officers eligible for the Association.

(4) Development of a summary of the unique state plan criteria and techniques and to report supportive rationale as indicated by state utilizing unique criteria. (Titles I and VI-A)

Assumptions

Given the nature of any study plus the uncertainties inherent in the flow of federal monies, two basic assumptions were recognized:

(1) The criteria now utilized in state plans would have some value regardless of the source of funds.

(2) Professionalization or self-evaluation within any state can be facilitated by awareness of other state's criteria, ideas, or techniques.

Study Procedures

In order to fulfill the purposes of the study, the following procedures were utilized for the selected activities. Procedures follow the underlined activities:

Development of a list of common responsibilities inherent for state facilities commissions in related federal legislation.

A member of the Committee on Administration and State Plans agreed to accept the general responsibility to draft such a list for consideration of the Executive Council and Committee on Administration and State Plans.

Development of a calendar of important dates related to the partnership between state and federal government.

A member of the Committee on Administration and State Plans was asked to work with the Office of Education staff in developing a calendar including important dates for the various types or reports or contacts during a fiscal year.

Development of an analysis of the various state-designated responsibilities delegated to the agencies with chief executive officers eligible for the Association.

The Chairman of the Committee on Administration and State Plans agreed to develop a questionnaire to be reviewed by Executive Council which would elicit a general description of the various responsibilities and intra-state operational patterns related to member agencies. Subjective analysis was required for treatment of any clarification comments forwarded.

Development of a summary of the unique state plan criteria and techniques and to report supportive rationale as indicated by states utilizing unique criteria. (Titles I and VI-A)

The Chairman of the Committee on Administration and State Plans agreed to develop a questionnaire to be sent to all state facilities agencies. This questionnaire was to ask each state to forward features of the state plan for Title I and VI-A which served a special state purpose or produced a particular administrative effect. Factors were to be cited for required priority factors and other priority factors. Also, states were to report the date and a brief description of the most recent major state plan changes (Titles I and VI-A). States were also asked to report any planned unrequired change and briefly report nature and purpose.

Upon receipt of completed questionnaires, the staff of the Tennessee Higher Education Facilities Commission agreed to compile analyses of the responses.

CHAPTER II

OBJECTIVES AND FUNCTIONS DELEGATED TO FACILITIES COMMISSIONS

The following version of objectives and functions was developed to provide a general picture of responsibilities implicit and explicit in laws, regulations and actions by the Federal government regarding facilities commissions. The objectives and functions as recorded should facilitate state self-evaluation if desired, and could serve as a working paper for state organizational study. Wide variation would be expected from state to state, especially regarding objectives and emphases.

Objectives

A. Major

1. To make optimum use of Federal funds available for the support of institutions of higher education in assigned areas.

B. Subordinate

1. To insure equitable distribution of Federal funds, based upon applications received.

2. To maximize the ability of the institutions to qualify for other Federal grants.

Functions

A. Administration of Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act

1. Develop, publish and update whenever desirable, a State Plan for distribution of grants for academic facilities.

2. Develop forms for use by institutions to provide information not contained in the Federal application but needed by the State Commissions in their evaluation of applications in accordance with the criteria set forth in the State Plan.

3. Keep institutions informed of the availability of funds, of changes in the federal regulations, forms and instructions, and in the State Plan and of the closing dates for the submission of applications.

4. Distribute application forms, instructions, etc. to eligible institutions.

5. Provide consulting service for the applicants in the interpretation of regulations, federal instructions and the state plan. Assist institutions in preparing grant applications and, within the legal limits, in amending and (or) correcting of applications submitted to the State Commission.

6. Receive and record all applications received, and assign a State Commission Control number to all applications.

7. Review applications for Title I grants for completeness, accuracy and eligibility.

8. Verify the information contained in the application by referring to HEGIS reports, comparison with previous applications and institutional audits.

9. Calculate the point score for each eligible application, determine the ranking of all applications, and determine how far federal funds will go.

10. Prepare federal documents related to the applications and their ranking.

11. Adopt a formal recommendation for the distribution of the federal funds.

12. Forward applications recommended for grants together with pertinent federal documents to the regional office of the Office of Education.

13. Notify by correspondence the successful as well as the unsuccessful applications of the recommendations made.

14. Administer federal funds received for State Commissions expenses. This function includes the preparation of budgets, obtaining funds under the letter of credit system, deposit of federal funds, expenditure of funds, and periodic reporting of receipts and expenditures.

B. Administration of Title VI-A, Higher Education Act of 1965

1. Develop, publish and update whenever desirable, a State Plan for distribution of grants for academic facilities.

2. Develop forms for use by institutions to provide information not contained in the federal application, but needed by the State Commissions in their evaluation of applications in accordance with the criteria set forth in the State Plan.

3. Keep institutions informed of the availability of funds, of changes in the federal regulations, forms and instructions, and in the State Plan and of the closing dates for the submission of applications.

4. Distribute application forms, instructions, etc. to eligible institutions.

5. Provide consulting service for the applicants in the interpretation of regulations, federal instructions and the state plan. Assist institutions in preparing grant applications and, within the legal limits, in amending and (or) correcting of applications submitted to the State Commission.

6. Receive and record all applications received, and assign a State Commission Control number to all applications.

7. Review applications for Title VI grants for completeness, accuracy and eligibility.

8. Verify the information contained in the application by referring to HEGIS reports, comparison with previous applications and institutional audits.

9. Calculate the point score for each eligible application, determine the ranking of all applications, and determine how far federal funds will go.

10. Prepare federal documents related to the applications and their ranking.

11. Adopt a formal recommendation for the distribution of the federal funds.

12. Forward applications recommended for grants together with pertinent federal documents to the Office of Education.

13. Notify by correspondence the successful as well as the unsuccessful applications of the recommendations made.

14. Decide on budget changes requested by institutions after grant award.

15. Collect project completion reports from last year's grant recipients and forward them to the Office of Education.

16. Administer federal funds received for State Commission expenses. This function includes the preparation of budgets, obtaining funds under the letter of credit system, deposit of federal funds, expenditure of funds, and periodic reporting of receipts and expenditures.

C. Facilities Comprehensive Planning

1. Develop an annual proposal and budget for the expenditure of basic facilities comprehensive planning grants. Forward the proposal to the Office of Education.

2. Upon approval of the annual proposal, carry out the program which was approved by the Office of Education.

3. Administer federal funds received for facilities comprehensive planning.

D. Administration of Title III, Higher Education Facilities Act

1. Provide consulting service for the applicants in the interpretation of federal regulations and instructions and assist them in the preparation of applications.

2. Receive from applicant the original and three copies of the application.

3. Review the application data relating to space utilization, enrollment projections and institutional relevance to students from low-income families. Verify this data or if after consultation with the applicant verification seems inappropriate, comment on the data stated by the applicant.

4. Retain one copy of the application and return the other applications to the institution to be forwarded to the Office of Education.

5. Promote additional applications by keeping institutions in the State informed about program essentials and closing dates.

E. Administration of Excess Property Program

1. Receive institutional transfer order for Excess Personal Property from public or private institutions.

2. Review transfer order for verification that the items requested relate directly to a basic Title VI-A grant.

3. Forward verified transfer order to proper federal agency or return to institution with request for further clarification.

4. Promote acquisition of excess property in the State by informing the institutions of higher education and especially the recipients of Title VI-A grants of the essential features of the Excess Property Program.

F. HEGIS (Higher Education General Information Survey)

1. Assist public and private institutions in listing building and room inventory data on federal HEGIS reporting form 2300-7.

2. Receive reporting forms 2300-7 from the institutions. Record all reports received, desk edit them for arithemetical balancing and for compliance with the edit procedures manual published by Higher Education Facilities Services, Inc. (HEFS)

3. Prepare file copies of the completed reports and mail originals to HEFS for computer edits.

4. Receive computer edits and error listings from HEFS and resolve the errors by checking with the individual institution.

5. Forward results to HEFS for preparation of a magnetic tape summary for the Federal National Center of Educational Statistics.

CHAPTER III

CALENDAR OF DATES RELATED TO AGENCY OPERATION

The Committee on Administration and State Plans was not successful in developing a calendar of dates which would serve as a guideline for agencies. After some efforts toward developing the calendar, it was decided that the calendar could be more easily developed, more meaningful and quite possibly more accurate after Congress acts and/or the new fiscal year begins. In addition, it was felt that publishing such a calendar in this study could indicate an unwarranted appearance of permanence to the calendar.

The Committee on Administration and State Plans recommends that the new officers and Executive Council of the Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education Facilities Commissions direct some attention to development of a calendar of important dates early in each fiscal year.

CHAPTER IV

STATE DESIGNATED RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACILITIES COMMISSION

SUMMARY

A. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Titles I and III HEFA

Yes 48 No 0

B. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Title VI-A

Yes 48 No 0

C. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Annual Interest Grants

Yes 43 No 4 *(one Not Answered)

D. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Comprehensive Planning

Yes 42 No 6

E. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Planning other than Federally supported

Yes 21 No 27

F. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Guaranteed Loan Programs

Yes 11 No 36 *(one Not Answered)

G. Our agency is solely responsible for the administration of Title I, HEA (community service)

Yes 14 No 33 *(one Not Answered)

H. Our agency is a separate agency for the administration of Federal programs

Yes 23 No 25

I. Our agency does expect a major role change or shift of responsibility during the calendar year

Yes 8 No 41 *(two states answered Yes and No - one Not Answered)

STATE DESIGNATED RESPONSIBILITIES

RESPONSES* BY STATE

State		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Alabama	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)
Alaska	Yes	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)
Arkansas	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
California	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)
Colorado	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)
Connecticut	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	(X)
Delaware	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )
Florida	Yes	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	(X)	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Georgia	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)
Hawaii	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)
Idaho	Yes	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	(X)	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)
Illinois	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)
Indiana	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )
Iowa	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)
Kansas	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Kentucky	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)

*Letters across top of columns keyed to previous page.

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Maine	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)
Maryland	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)
Michigan	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)
Minnesota	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)
Mississippi	Yes	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)
Missouri	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	(x)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)
Montana	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)
Nebraska	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)
Nevada	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)
New Hampshire	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)
New Jersey	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)
New Mexico	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)
New York	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)	(x)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )	( )	(x)
North Carolina	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )
North Dakota	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )	( )	( )	(x)
Ohio	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )	(x)	(x)
Oklahoma	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	(x)	(x)
Oregon	Yes	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	( )	(x)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(x)	( )	(x)	(x)

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Pennsylvania	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )
Rhode Island	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	(X)
South Carolina	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )
South Dakota	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	(X)
Tennessee	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)
	No	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )
Texas	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)
Utah	Yes	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	(X)	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
Virginia	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)
W. Virginia	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	(X)
Wyoming	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)
Puerto Rico	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)
D. C.	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	( )	(X)	( )	(X)
Guam	Yes	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)	( )	( )	( )
	No	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	(X)	(X)	(X)

NO RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Arizona
*Hawaii
Massachusetts
Vermont
Washington
Wisconsin
Virgin Islands

*Received late - included in Chapter IV only.

Clarifying Comments on Status

As of July 1, 1972 the Indiana Advisory Commission on Academic Facilities will be disestablished by Executive Order and its functions and responsibilities assigned to the statutorily created Commission for Higher Education of the State of Indiana which will also administer Title I, Title VI-A, and will also have complete responsibility for state-wide planning for higher education.

The Iowa Commission had the following additional programs: (1) State of Iowa Scholarship Program, (2) Iowa Tuition Grant Program, (3) Iowa Medical Tuition Loan Plan.

In September of 1971, the State Board of Higher Education was designated as the State Commission in New Jersey.

The North Carolina General Assembly had enacted legislation providing for a Board of Governors to exercise governing authority over the public senior system of higher education effective July 1, 1972. The expectation was that the current agency will be directly related to the new Board.

In Pennsylvania the powers and duties of the State Commission were to be transferred to the State Board of Education.

In Tennessee plans were developing to assure closer coordination with the Higher Education Commission created on July 1, 1967 to provide coordination for higher education.

CHAPTER V

TITLE I: STATE PLAN

States were asked to list features of their state plans which served a special purpose or produced a particular administrative effect. The following report of such features follows the outline of the basic questionnaire (see Appendix A). Wherever the same basic idea was reported more than once examples were selected at random.

A. Required Priority Factors

1. Enrollment Increase

Use of both numerical and percentage basis reported by several states - examples from : Alaska, pgs. 3 to 6, New York, pgs. 5 and 13, Tennessee, pgs. 14, 15, and 19 (past history and self-scoring)

Alaska

Relative priorities of projects for public community colleges and public technical institutes will be determined as follows:

For established institutions or branch campuses: Expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity as evidenced by the planned reasonably expected numerical increase in undergraduate enrollment at the institution for the third fall term after the fall term preceding the date of application, expressed in full-time student equivalents enrolled in the fall semester, trimester or quarter. "Full-time student equivalents" shall be computed by totaling all credit hours of regularly enrolled undergraduate students in the autumn semester, trimester, or quarter. Points by relative rank of the institutions to be assigned as follows:

20 points for placement in the highest 20%
16 points for placement in the second highest 20%
12 points for placement in the third highest 20%
8 points for placement in the fourth highest 20%
0 points for placement in the lowest 20%

Expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity as evidenced by the planned and reasonably expected percentage increase in undergraduate enrollment at the institution for the second fall term after the date of the application, expressed in full-time student equivalents for that fall term, by relative ranking of all project applications. Five points to be assigned divided as follows:

5 points for placement in the highest 20%
4 points for placement in the second highest 20%

3 points for placement in the third highest 20%
2 points for placement in the fourth highest 20%
0 points for placement in the fifth highest 20%

For new institutions or branch campuses (those which were not in operation as of the fourth fall term preceding the date of application), applications will be assigned points for each of the factors listed below, by the method indicated:

The enrollment expected in the third fall term after the fall term preceding the date of application, in terms of the planned and reasonably expected absolute number of full-time equivalent undergraduate students enrolled in the fall semester, trimester or quarter. Points to be assigned as follows:

Over 500 full-time equivalent students	40 points
401 to 500 full-time equivalent students	30 "
301 to 400 full-time equivalent students	15 "
201 to 300 full-time equivalent students	5 "
Less than 200 full-time equivalent students	0 "

For established institutions or branch campuses (those which were in operation as of the fourth fall term preceding the date of application), applications will be assigned points for the factors listed below, by the method indicated:

Expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity as evidenced by the planned and reasonably expected numerical increase in undergraduate enrollment at the institution for the third fall term after the date of the application, expressed in full-time student equivalents for that fall term, by relative ranking of all project applications. Twenty points to be assigned as follows:

20 points for placement in highest 20%
15 points for placement in second highest 20%
10 points for placement in the third highest 20%
5 points for placement in the fourth highest 20%
0 points for placement in lowest 20%

Expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity as evidenced by the planned and reasonably expected percentage increase in undergraduate enrollment at the institution for the third fall term after the date of application, expressed in full-time student equivalents for that fall term, by relative ranking of all project applications. Five points to be assigned as follows:

5 points for placement in the highest 20%
4 points for placement in the second highest 20%
3 points for placement in the third highest 20%
2 points for placement in the fourth highest 20%
0 points for placement in the lowest 20%

New York

The planned and reasonably expected percentage increase in undergraduate enrollment (full-time-equivalent number) at the institution for the fourth fall term after the date of application. Possible score of 15 points, assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in upper 6 2/3%	15 pts.	
Rank order placement in second highest 6 2/3%	14 "	
Rank order placement in third highest 6 2/3%	13 "	
Rank order placement in fourth highest 6 2/3%	12 "	
Rank order placement in fifth highest 6 2/3%	11 "	
Rank order placement in sixth highest 6 2/3%	10 "	
Rank order placement in seventh highest 6 2/3%	9 "	(Not
Rank order placement in eighth highest 6 2/3%	8 "	relevant)
Rank order placement in ninth highest 6 2/3%	7 "	
Rank order placement in tenth highest 6 2/3%	6 "	
Rank order placement in eleventh highest 6 2/3%	5 "	
Rank order placement in twelth highest 6 2/3%	4 "	
Rank order placement in thirteenth highest 6 2/3%	3 "	
Rank order placement in fourteenth highest 6 2/3%	2 "	
Rank order placement in lowest 6 2/3%	1 "	

The planned and reasonably expected numerical increase in undergraduate enrollment (full-time-equivalent number) at the institution for the fourth fall term after the date of the application. Possible score of 15 or 45 points, assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in upper 6 2/3%	15 pts.	45 pts.
Rank order placement in second highest 6 2/3%	14 "	42 "
Rank order placement in third highest 6 2/3%	13 "	39 "
Rank order placement in fourth highest 6 2/3%	12 "	36 "
Rank order placement in fifth highest 6 2/3%	11 "	33 "
Rank order placement in sixth highest 6 2/3%	10 "	30 "
Rank order placement in seventh highest 6 2/3%	9 "	27 "
Rank order placement in eighth highest 6 2/3%	8 "	24 "
Rank order placement in ninth highest 6 2/3%	7 "	21 "
Rank order placement in tenth highest 6 2/3%	6 "	18 "
Rank order placement in eleventh highest 6 2/3%	5 "	15 "
Rank order placement in twelth highest 6 2/3%	4 "	12 "
Rank order placement in thirteenth highest 6 2/3%	3 "	9 "
Rank order placement in fourteenth highest 6 2/3%	2 "	6 "
Rank order placement in lowest 6 2/3%	1 "	3 "

Tennessee

Relative priorities of eligible projects for institutions other than public community colleges and public technical institutes will be determined as follows:

Points for relative priority ratings for existing institutions or branch campuses (which are defined as those institutions or branch campuses in operation as of the fall term preceding the date of application and/or those institutions or branch campuses in operation as of the applicable closing date) shall be awarded on the basis of the following criteria:

Percentage Increase in Undergraduate Enrollment

Planned and reasonably expected percentage increase in undergraduate enrollment (full-time equivalent number - twelve quarter hours or equivalent may be considered as a full-time student load. The full-time equivalent number of part-time students may be calculated by dividing total number of credit hours of part-time students by the normal load for a full-time student at the institution or branch campus) at the institution or branch campus for the third fall term after the fall term preceding the date of application.

Percent	Points
Over 17.0	10
15.1 - 17.0	9
13.1 - 15.0	8
11.1 - 13.0	7
9.1 - 11.0	6
7.1 - 9.0	5
5.1 - 7.0	4
3.1 - 5.0	3
1.1 - 3.0	2
under 1.1	1

Planned and reasonably expected numerical increase in undergraduate enrollment (full-time equivalent number-twelve quarter hours or equivalent may be considered as a full-time student load. The full-time equivalent number of part-time students may be calculated by dividing total number of credit hours of part-time students by the normal load for a full-time student at the institution or branch campus) at the institution or branch campus for the third fall term after the fall term preceding the date of application.

Increase	Points
Over 1700	10
1501 - 1700	9
1301 - 1500	8
1101 - 1300	7
901 - 1100	6
701 - 900	5
501 - 700	4
301 - 500	3

(cont'd)

101 - 300	2
100 or less	1

Past Percentage Increase in Undergraduate Enrollment

Percentage increase in undergraduate enrollment (full-time equivalent) at the institution or branch campus which has occurred between the fall opening three years previous to the most recent fall opening and the most recent fall opening.

Percentage Increase During the Three Previous Years	Points
15.1 and over	5
11.1 - 15.0	4
7.1 - 11.0	3
3.1 - 7.0	2
Any increase - 3.0	1

Past Numerical Increase in Undergraduate Enrollment

Numerical increase in undergraduate enrollment (full-time equivalent at the institution or branch campus which has occurred between the fall opening three years previous to the most recent fall opening and the most recent fall opening.

Numerical Increase During The Three Previous Years	Points
1501 and over	5
1101 to 1500	4
701 to 1100	3
301 to 700	2
Any increase to 300	1

2. Increase in Net Square Footage

Most states reported use of numerical and percentage categories. Several states mentioned earlier studies as basic for credibility. Florida related actual growth to planned growth as recorded in earlier study (see Chapter VII). Examples: New Hampshire, p. 6, Indiana, p. 7.

New Hampshire

The percentage by which the construction of the project will increase the square feet of instructional and library areas of the institution or branch campus.

Established Institutions		New Institutions
Possible score of	15 points	Not a criterion for priority
1st quintile	15 points	
2nd quintile	12 points	
3rd quintile	9 points	
4th quintile	6 points	
5th quintile	3 points	

The amount by which the construction of the project will increase the square feet of instructional and library areas of the institution or branch campus.

Established Institutions		New Institutions	
Possible score of	0 points	Possible score of	25 points
1st quintile	0 points	1st quintile	25 points
2nd quintile	0 points	2nd quintile	20 points
3rd quintile	0 points	3rd quintile	15 points
4th quintile	0 points	4th quintile	10 points

Indiana

The amount by which construction of the project for which a Title I grant is requested will increase the square feet of assignable area in instructional and library facilities at the campus at which the project is to be constructed. Possible score of 10 points, assigned by rank order placement among all projects under consideration (for both established and new campuses).

Rank order placement in the highest 10% of range	10 points
Rank order placement in the second highest 10%	9 points
Rank order placement in the third highest 10%	8 points
Rank order placement in the fourth highest 10%	7 points
Rank order placement in the fifth highest 10%	6 points
Rank order placement in the fifth lowest 10%	5 points
Rank order placement in the fourth lowest 10%	4 points
Rank order placement in the third lowest 10%	3 points
Rank order placement in the second lowest 10%	2 points
Rank order placement in the lowest 10% of range	1 point

The percentage by which the construction of the project for which a Title I grant is requested will increase the square feet of assignable area in instructional and library facilities at the campus at which the project is to be constructed. Possible score of 10 pts., assigned by rank order placement among projects for established campuses only.

Rank order placement in highest 10% of range	10 points
Rank order placement in the second highest 10%	9 points
Rank order placement in the third highest 10%	8 points
Rank order placement in the fourth highest 10%	7 points
Rank order placement in the fifth highest 10%	6 points
Rank order placement in the fifth lowest 10%	5 points
Rank order placement in the fourth lowest 10%	4 points
Rank order placement in the third lowest 10%	3 points
Rank order placement in the second lowest 10%	2 points
Rank order placement in the lowest 10% of range	1 point

The capacity/enrollment ratio as of the fall term preceding the date of application at the campus at which the project is to be constructed. (Applications ranked from lowest ratio to highest ratio). Possible score of 20 pts., assigned by rank order placement among projects for established campuses only.

3. Utilization

Factors employed for ascertaining utilization priority included average weekly room period use and capacity enrollment were most reported. Arkansas measures utilization of similar space when new projects are submitted and examines twelve month utilization. New York recognized various types of space and use ratios. Examples following include New Mexico, p. 6, Revision 1, Arkansas, pgs. 5 to 12 and New York, pgs. 6and7.

New Mexico

The degree of utilization of existing facilities, as evidenced by the institution's capacity/enrollment ratio as of the fall term preceding the date of the application on the campus at which the project is to be constructed. The capacity/enrollment ratio is that ratio obtained by dividing the total square feet of assignable area in instructional and library facilities at the campus at which the facilities are to be constructed by the total student clock-hour enrollment, rounded to the second decimal place. Possible score of 10 points, which is determined by the method indicated below for all projects submitted under Section 7.2a which are under consideration as of the last closing date.

Capacity/Enrollment Ratio	Points
Under 2.25	10
2.25 - 2.49	9
2.50 - 2.74	8
2.75 - 2.99	7
3.00 - 3.24	6
3.25 - 3.49	5
3.50 - 3.74	4
3.75 - 3.99	3
4.00 - 4.24	2
4.25 - 4.49	1
4.50 - and Above	0

Arkansas

The capacity/enrollment ratio as of the fall term preceding the date of application at the campus at which the project is to be constructed. (Applications ranked downward from lowest ratio to highest ratio).

Possible Score of 10 Points, (Sections 104 and 103) assigned as follows:

Rank Order Placement	Points Section 104	103
Highest or 1st quintile	10	10
Second highest or 2nd quintile	8	8
Third highest or 3rd quintile	6	6
Fourth highest or 4th quintile	4	4
Fifth highest or 5th quintile	2	2

In the event that more than five applications are assigned priorities, points are assigned by the quintile rankings. When five or less applications are assigned priorities, points are assigned by rank order.

The degree to which facilities of the types to be provided by the project were utilized, as evidenced by the ratios shown in the following tables, as of the fall term preceding the date of the application at the campus at which the project will be constructed. A possible score of 30 points will be assigned to the various facility types in the same proportion that the assignable space in each facility type is of the total assignable area in the project. If a facility type represents less than ten percent of the total assignable area in the project, the 30 possible points will be distributed on the basis of the percentage the assignable area in each facility type is of the total assignable area of all facility types excluding the facility type which is less than ten percent of the area in the project.

Possible Score of 30 Points, (Sections 104 and 103) assigned as follows:

CLASSROOMS: The relationship of the assignable area in classrooms and the weekly student clock hours or regularly scheduled supervised instruction in this type of facility.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per W.S.C.H.	Points Section 104	103
Less than .75	30	30
.75- .79	27	27
.80- .84	24	24
.85- .89	21	21
.90- .94	18	18
.95- .99	15	15
1.00-1.04	12	12
1.05-1.09	9	9
1.10-1.14	6	6
1.15-1.19	3	3
1.20 or more	0	0

TEACHING LABORATORIES AND SHOPS: The relationship of the assignable area in teaching laboratories and shops and the weekly student clock hours of regularly scheduled supervised instruction in this type facility.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per W.S.C.H.	Points Section 104	103
Less than 2.85	30	30
2.85-2.94	27	27
2.95-3.04	24	24
3.05-3.14	21	21
3.15-3.24	18	18
3.25-3.34	15	15
3.35-3.44	12	12
3.45-3.54	9	9
3.55-3.64	6	6
3.65-3.74	3	3
3.75 or more	0	0

PHYSICAL EDUCATION LABORATORIES: The relationship of the assignable area in physical education laboratories and the weekly student clock hours of regularly scheduled supervised instruction in this type in facility.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per W.S.C.H.	Points Section 104	103
Less than 7.5	30	30
7.5- 7.9	27	27
8.0- 8.4	24	24
8.5- 8.9	21	21
9.0- 9.4	18	18
9.5- 9.9	15	15
10.0-10.4	12	12
10.5-10.9	9	9
11.0-11.4	6	6
11.5-11.9	3	3
12.0 or more	0	0

FACULTY OFFICES: The relationship of the assignable area in faculty offices and the full-time equivalent number of students.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per F. T. E. Student	Points Section 104	103
Less than 5.5	30	30
5.5-5.9	27	27
6.0-6.4	24	24
6.5-6.9	21	21
7.0-7.4	18	18
7.5-7.9	15	15
8.0-8.4	12	12
8.5-8.9	9	9
9.0-9.4	6	6
9.5-9.9	3	3
10.0 or more	0	0

OTHER INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTION RELATED FACILITIES

(Excluding Farm Facilities) The relationship of the assignable area in other instruction and instruction related facilities and the full-time equivalent number of students.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per F. T. E. Student	Points Section 104	Points Section 103
Less than 12.5	30	30
12.5-12.9	27	27
13.0-13.4	24	24
13.5-13.9	21	21
14.0-14.4	18	18
14.5-14.9	15	15
15.0-15.4	12	12
15.5-15.9	9	9
16.0-16.4	6	6
16.5-16.9	3	3
17.0 or more	0	0

LIBRARY: The relationship of the assignable area in library space and the full-time equivalent number of students.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per F.T.E. Student	Points Section 104	Points Section 103
Less than 11.0	30	30
11.0-11.4	27	27
11.5-11.9	24	24
12.0-12.4	21	21
12.5-12.9	18	18
13.0-13.4	15	15
13.5-13.9	12	12
14.0-14.4	9	9
14.5-14.9	6	6
15.0-15.4	3	3
15.5 or more	0	0

RESEARCH: The relationship of the assignable area in teaching laboratories and shops and the weekly student clock hours of regularly scheduled supervised instruction in teaching laboratories and shops.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per W.S.C.H.	Points Section 104	Points Section 103
Less than 2.85	30	30
2.85-2.94	27	27
2.95-3.04	24	24
3.05-3.14	21	21

cont'd

3.15-3.24	18
3.25-3.34	15
3.35-3.44	12
3.45-3.54	9
3.55-3.64	6
3.65-3.74	3
3.75 or more	0

ADMINISTRATIVE: The relationship of the assignable area in administrative space and the full-time equivalent number of students.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per F. T. E. Student	Points Section 104	103
Less than 1.0	30	30
1.0-1.4	27	27
1.5-1.9	24	24
2.0-2.4	21	21
2.5-2.9	18	18
3.0-3.4	15	15
3.5-3.9	12	12
4.0-4.4	9	9
4.5-4.9	6	6
5.0-5.4	3	3
5.5 or more	0	0

PHYSICAL PLANT SERVICE: The relationship of the assignable area in physical plant service and the full-time equivalent numberof students.

Assignable Sq. Ft. per F. T. E. Students	Points Section 104	103
Less than 3.0	30	30
3.0- 3.9	27	27
4.0- 4.9	24	24
5.0- 5.9	21	21
6.0- 6.9	18	18
7.0- 7.9	15	15
8.0- 8.9	12	12
9.0- 9.9	9	9
10.0-10.9	6	6
11.0-11.9	3	3
12.0 or more	0	0

New York

The degree of utilization of existing instructional and library facilities as evidenced by:

The relationship (ratio) between assignable classroom space and student clock hours (assignable square feet divided by student clock hours of classroom type of instruction). Applications with smallest ratios will be ranked highest for point assignments. Possible score of 5 points, assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in highest 20%	5 pts.	
Rank order placement in second highest 20%	4 "	
Rank order placement in third highest 20%	3 "	(Not
Rank order placement in fourth highest 20%	2 "	relevant)
Rank order placement in fifth highest 20%	1 pt.	

The relationship (ratio) between assignable laboratory space and the student clock hours (assignable square feet divided by student clock hours of laboratory type of instruction). Applications with smallest ratios will be ranked highest for point assignments. Possible score of 5 points, assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in highest 20%	5 pts.	
Rank order placement in second highest 20%	4 "	
Rank order placement in third highest 20%	3 "	(Not
Rank order placement in fourth highest 20%	2 "	relevant)
Rank order placement in fifth highest 20%	1 pt.	

The relationship (ratio) between assignable library space and the full-time-equivalent number of students (assignable square feet of library space divided by the total full-time-equivalent number of students as reported in the application.) Applications with smallest ratios will be ranked highest for point assignments. Possible score of 10 pts. assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in highest 10%	10 pts.	
Rank order placement in second highest 10%	9 "	
Rank order placement in third highest 10%	8 "	
Rank order placement in the fourth highest 10%	7 "	
Rank order placement in the fifth highest 10%	6 "	(Not
Rank order placement in the sixth highest 10%	5 "	relevant)
Rank order placement in the seventh highest 10%	4 "	
Rank order placement in the eighth highest 10%	3 "	
Rank order placement in the ninth highest 10%	2 "	
Rank order placement in the tenth highest 10%	1 pt.	

The relationship (ratio) between all other instructional space and the full-time-equivalent number of students (assignable square feet of instructional and library facilities minus classroom, laboratory, and library space divided by the total full-time-

equivalent number of students as reported in the application. Applications with smallest ratios will be ranked highest for point assignments. Possible score of 5 points, assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in highest 20%	5 pts.	
Rank order placement in second highest 20%	4 "	
Rank order placement in third highest 20%	3 "	(Not
Rank order placement in fourth highest 20%	2 "	relevant)
Rank order placement in fifth highest 20%	1 pt.	

B. Other Priority Factors

Arkansas considered percent of obsolete and unsafe structures, stressed importance of use of replaced facilities and "year round" use. California gave priority to classrooms and laboratories over physical education projects, recognized varying financial ability of 103 districts, penalized for previous grants, and rewarded high percentage of classroom and class laboratory facilities in projects. Colorado gave priority to projects starting without delay. Connecticut diminished the importance of priority factors by setting maximum initial dollar limit to spread funds. Florida awarded priority to projects excluding purchase of land and rights of way from project and for documentation of availability of non-grant funds. Georgia deducted priority for recency and amount of previous recommendations. Illinois attempted to penalize enrollment overprojections and slow construction starts. Indiana gave priority to projects where opportunities for disadvantaged were increased. Kansas limited any project to 50% of the state allotment in either Section 103 or 104 to fund more projects during periods of reduced allotments. Kentucky and Tennessee used self-scoring procedures which tended to place pressure properly on criteria and enabled reporting of more specific scoring bases. Maryland gave priority for summer school enrollment, long-range plan (Texas also), and for having received a partial grant in the previous year. New York related priority to high school graduates in area, geographic make-up of enrollment, occupational and technical space, per capita personal income and per capita taxable real property. North Carolina gave priority to areas where high percentage of students in county were not enrolled in post-secondary institutions. Texas awarded priority for development of master campus plan including facilities enrollment and programs for at least five years. District of Columbia rewarded meeting a prefiling deadline and Tennessee awarded priority points for conference at least thirty days before closing date.

The above summary represented much supporting study and required, in some cases, lengthy sections of state plans. The following illustrative examples were selected to better define the many options listed above, For the sake of brevity, editorial license was used to cite only parts of some of the language of subject state plans. The following excerpts illustrate some of the ideas underlined above:

Obsolete and Unsafe Structures (Arkansas, p. 14) The percentage of the total assignable area of instructional and library facilities, at the campus where the project will be constructed, which are in temporary structures or obsolete or unsafe structures for which renovation is not economically feasible, according to standards established and published (at least 60 days in advance of any closing date to which applicable) by the State Commission.

Possible Score of 5 Points, (Sections 104 and 103) assigned as follows:

Rank Order Placement	Points Section 104	Points Section 103
Highest or 1st quintile	5	5
Second highest or 2nd quintile	4	4
Third highest or 3rd quintile	3	3
Fourth highest or 4th quintile	2	2
Fifth highest or 5th quintile	1	1

In the event that more than five applications are assigned priorities, points are assigned by the quintile rankings. When five or less applications are assigned priorities, points are assigned by rank order.

"Year Round" Use (Arkansas, p. 15) The degree to which facilities are used "year round" as evidenced by the percentage the student semester credit hour production in the fall term one year prior to the fall term preceding the date of the application is of the total hours produced during the twelve(12) month period which begins with the previously mentioned fall term.

Possible Score of 5 Points, (Sections 104 and 103) assigned as follows:

Percent Fall Term is of Annual	Points Section 104	Points Section 103
Less than 40.0%	5	5
40.0 - 42.9%	4	4
43.0 - 45.9%	3	3
46.0 - 48.9%	2	2
49.0 - 51.9%	1	1
52% or more	0	0

Use of Replaced Facilities (Arkansas, p. 16) Ten (10) points shall be assigned to the application if a written statement is submitted which indicates the planned use of facilities which the institution expects to be replaced by the project. If the facilities to be replaced by the project are to be converted and the conversion is not a part of the project, the written statement shall include preliminary floor plans of the facility as it will appear after the conversion completed. The written statement shall also include a narrative justification of the need for space of the type which will result from the conversion of the facilities to be replaced by the project. If the institution plans to remove existing facilities as a result of the construction of the project, the written statement shall include a statement of the condition (temporary, obsolete or permanent as defined in this State Plan) of the building to be removed. If the project will not replace existing facilities this fact should be noted in the written statement from the institution. The points shall be assigned as follows:

Written Statement Submitted If Applicable	Points Section 104	103
Yes or not Applicable	10	10
No	0	0

Classrooms and Laboratories over Physical Education (California notes) Non-Physical Education Projects (Section 103, Standard 6) Consistent with the general California position that academic classrooms are in short supply, priority with respect to need is given to classroom and classlab projects. This standard is a reflection of Coordinating Council policy.

Varying Financial Ability of 103 District (California notes) District Financial Ability (Section 103, Standard 7) This policy oriented standard is designed to provide an advantage in the project priority to the least financially able districts as measured by their tax base.

Percentage of Classroom and Class Laboratories in Project (California notes) This policy oriented standard is designed to work in conjunction with Standards 5 and 6 to place funds in those institutions with the highest utilization and whose projects will make available the greatest number of instructional feet.

Projects Starting Without Delay (Colorado, p. 19)

A maximum of 5 points to be awarded as follows:

On contracts to be let within 12 months of the grant offer: 5 pts.
On contracts to be let within 18 months of the grant offer: 3 pts.
On contracts to be let 18 months or more after the grant offer: 1 pt.

This criterion shall also apply to proposed projects for construction at campuses which were not in operation as of the fourth fall term preceding the date of application, with the exception that:

On contracts to be let within 12 months of the grant offer: 10 points
On contracts to be let within 18 months of the grant offer: 8 points
On contracts to be let within 18 months or more after the grant offer: 1 point

New Projects Excluding Purchase of Land (Florida, p. 14) (only 5 pts. on existing)

Is purchase of land and/or rights-of-way included as an estimated eligible development cost in the project for which funds are requested?

Land Development Cost	Points
Yes	0
No	25

Penalty for Overprojection (Illinois, p. 15) Effective November 10, 1967, the State Commission, in determining the total points to be used for establishing project priorities, will deduct one (1) point for each percentage point by which an applicant who has previously been awarded a grant fails to achieve, by the third fall term after the fall term opening immediately preceding the closing date for which that earlier grant was awarded, the percentage increase in undergraduate FTE enrollment estimated to result from the construction proposed for that campus, except that if the percentage increase in undergraduate FTE enrollment is within six (6) percentage points of the estimate, no penalty will be assessed. By November 10, 1967, and in subsequent years, if more than one grant has been awarded for the campus, percentage points of underestimates of percentage increase in undergraduate FTE enrollment in relation to one or more approved projects will be considered to offset an equal number of percentage points of overestimates of percentage increase in undergraduate FTE enrollment on other approved projects.

(b) Overestimates and underestimates will be computed only on FTE enrollments achieved by the third fall term after the fall term which opened immediately preceding the closing date for which each grant was approved.

(c) Underestimates will offset overestimates only if the underestimate relates to approved projects submitted for the same campus as the approved project containing the overestimate ...

Opportunities for Disadvantaged (Indiana, pp. 6-7) Does the proposed construction relate to the need for higher education opportunities for economically disadvantaged youths in the community which the institution serves? Possible score of 15 points, assigned as follows:

(a) Is the institution located in an urban area and a participant in a comprehensive urban development program? A comprehensive urban development program may be defined as a federal, state, regional, or locally supported development to improve the quality of life within a specified geographic area. Such an area could be, for example, a "Model Neighborhood" as designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development under the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. However, other comprehensive planning programs focusing on the improvement of urban areas will qualify for a "yes" response to this question.

(b) Are more than 30% of the full-time students currently enrolled at the institution from families with a combined gross income of less than $6,000? If actual numbers are not known, you should provide the best estimate possible and indicate the source or method used to derive your estimate.

(c) Did more than 30% of the students enrolled at the institution receive financial assistance in the most recent year under one or more of the following programs: the National Defense Student Loan Program, College Work-Study Program, the Educational Opportunities Grants Program, or state assistance programs?

Points

(1)	Three "yes" answers	15 pts.
(2)	Two "yes" answers	10 pts.
(3)	One "yes" answer	5 pts.
(4)	No "yes" answers	0 pts.

Long Range Plan (Maryland, p. 23) The evidence of a feasible long range plan (at least five years) for institutional development of the applicant which describes the function and need of the proposed project. The scope of such a plan may be compiled and reported in a single document, or a series of inter-related documents. Points will be assigned in relation to the inclusion of the following factors:

(1) The future educational purposes and program of the institution;
(2) A formal study of enrollment projections for the institution and its major subdivisions, stating the assumptions which underlie the projections;
(3) A projection of the institution budget showing planned expenditures and sources of income;
(4) A study of the proposed faculty and staff needs;
(5) A comprehensive master plan for physical facilities.

Possible score of 20 points assigned as follows:

Plan accepted with	all five factors	20 pts.
" "	four factors	16 pts.
" "	three factors	12 pts.
" "	two factors	8 pts.
" "	one factor	4 pts.

(Revised 9/68)

Area High School Graduates - 103 (New York, p. 9) Population pressure for expansion of undergraduate enrollment in the geographic area where the applicant college is located. To be determined by computing the number of high school graduates of the preceding academic year in the county in which the institution is located and the contiguous counties in which no community college is located. Each Community College located in New York City shall be assigned an equal number of high school graduates for ranking purposes by dividing the total number of high school graduates in New York City by the number of public community colleges in operation.

The number of graduates to be ranked from high to low and a possible score of 5 points, assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
Rank order placement in upper 20 percent(%)	5 pts.	5 pts.
Rank order placement in second highest 20%	4 "	4 "
Rank order placement in third highest 20%	3 "	3 "
Rank order placement in fourth highest 20%	2 "	2 "
Rank order placement in fifth highest 20%	1 "	1 "

Note - Data on high school graduates will be that provided annually to the New York State Education Department.

Make-up of Enrollment - 103 (New York, pp. 9-10) The extension of educational opportunity to local high school graduates as indicated by the percent of the total full-time enrollment of the institution or branch made up of students who reside in the county in which it is located or contiguous counties in which no community college is located. A possible score of 5 points, assigned as follows:

Percentages	Points: Existing Institution	New Institution
90-100	5	5
80-89	4	4
70-79	3	3
60-69	2	2
50-59	1	1

Note - Data on the geographic distribution of institutional enrollment will be that provided annually to the State University of New York by the institutions.

Occupational and Technical Space - 103 (New York, p. 10) The percentage of instructional space of the proposed project designed specifically to house occupational and technical curriculums. A separate statement, accompanying each application and signed by the president will denote the rooms within the project that meet this requirement and secondly, the percentage that this space is to the total instructional and library space in the project. Possible score of 10 points assigned as follows:

	Existing Institution	New Institution
81-100% of the instructional space designed specifically for occupational or technical education.	10 pts.	10 pts.
61-80% of the instructional space designed specifically for occupational or technical education	8 pts.	8 pts.
41-60% of the instructional space designed specifically for occupational or technical education	6 pts.	6 pts.

Cont'd	Existing Institution	New Institution
21-40% of the instructional space designed specifically for occupational or technical education	4 pts.	4 pts.
1-20% of the instructional space designed specifically for occupational or technical education	2 pts.	2 pts.
Less than 1% of instructional space designed specifically for occupational or technical education	0 pts.	0 pts.

Per Capita Personal Income - 103 (New York, p. 10) The ability of the sponsoring county of each applicant community college to provide the necessary support for the expansion of academic facilities as is evidenced by the per-capita personal income in that county. A possible score of five points, assigned as follows:

Per Capita Personal Income in Sponsoring County	Existing Institution	New Institution
Less than $1999	5	5
2000 to 2249	4	4
2250 to 2499	3	3
2500 to 2999	2	2
3000 and over	1	1

Note - Per capita personal income data to be derived from the most recent published figures of the New York State Department of Commerce.

Per Capita Taxable Real Property - 103 (New York, p. 11) The ability of the sponsoring county of each applicant community college to provide the necessary support for the expansion of academic facilities as if evidenced by the full valuation of taxable real property per capita. A possible score of 5 points assigned as follows:

Taxable Property per Capita	Existing Institution	New Institution
Less than $4,000	5	5
4000 to 4499	4	4
4500 to 4999	3	3
5000 to 5499	2	2
5500 and over	1	1

Note 1: Data on taxable real property by county to be provided by the State Board or Equalization and Assessments.

Note 2: Data on population to be that provided by the New York State Department of Commerce.

Percentage Not Enrolled (North Carolina, pp. 9-10) Twenty (20) points will be assigned to projects requested by new and established institutions and branch campuses according to unmet needs for education beyond the high school in the county of location. These needs are reflected by the number and percentage of high school graduates not attending any post high school educational institution or serving in the Armed Forces as indicated in the most recent, "Follow-Up Survey, North Carolina High School Graduates, "published by the State Department of Public Instruction. Points in Table I will be assigned on the basis of the total number of all students listed in the "Survey" as "employed" and "not accounted for" in all administrative units of the county. Points in Table 2 will be assigned according to the percentage of recent high school graduates in the county listed as "employed" or "not accounted for."

(1) Number of High School Graduates Not Attending Institutions Beyong the High School

Percentile Rank	Points
84-99	10
67-83	8
51-66	6
34-50	4
17-33	2
1-16	0

(2) Percentage of High School Graduates Not Attending Institutions Beyond the High School

Percentile Rank	Points
84-99	10
67-83	8
51-66	6
34-50	4
17-33	2
1-16	0

Recent Major Plan Changes

Few major plan changes have been made in recent years. The decreased federal support had been a contributing factor. Most changes were related to the lower allotments and the majority of changes consisted of related changes such as allowing lower maximum grants and making all monies available at the earliest closing date.

Unrequired Plan Changes Expected This Calendar Year

Unrequired changes planned included mostly an up-dating effort and modernization of state plans in relation to current state and federal administrative practices. Other planned changes mentioned included types of changes already cited in this study and were mostly changes in priority emphasis or changes that would be required by the proposed new regulations. The only specific planned changes not mentioned earlier was an attempt by several states to raise priority for renovation projects.

CHAPTER VI

TITLE VI-A: STATE PLAN

Title VI-A requests were divided into two categories. Category I requests were to provide urgently needed equipment and materials for the improvement of undergraduate instruction. Category II requests were specifically targeted toward television equipment and materials for the improvement of undergraduate instruction.

A. Required Priority Factors

1. Some differentiation among institutions according to Average Basic Educational and General Expenditures was required. Many states employed a rank order system by percentile or decile, assigning priority to lower averages. The following example taken from the Alaska State Plan (Pg. 4) is illustrative of a rank order system.

> Relative priorities of laboratory and other special equipment projects will be determined as follows:
>
> The average of the basic educational and general expenditures per semester credit hour equivalent at the institution or branch campus for which the project is submitted, for the three completed institutional fiscal years immediately preceding the application. Priority will be given to lower averages.
>
> Possible score of 30 points assigned as follows:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Rank order placement in highest 20% | 30 pts. |
> | Rank order placement in second highest 20% | 24 pts. |
> | Rank order placement in third highest 20% | 18 pts. |
> | Rank order placement in fourth highest 20% | 12 pts. |
> | Rank order placement in fifth highest 20% | 6 pts. |

Some states used definite expenditure ranges and assigned a fixed number of points to be awarded to any institution within each level. The following example is taken from the South Dakota State Plan (Pg. 4).

> The State Commission will determine relative priorities for projects which appear to be eligible for funds alloted under Part A of Title VI of the Act, by application of the following standards and methods:
>
> Relative priorities of laboratory and other special equipment projects will be determined as follows:

The average of the basic educational and general expenditures per semester credit hour equivalent at the institution or branch campus for which the project is submitted for the three completed institutional fiscal years immediately preceding the closing date for which the application is filed (or for the completed years, if less than three). Possible score of 25 points assigned as follows:

Semester Hour Equivalent Cost	Points	Semester Hour Equivalent Cost	Points
$23.99 and under	25	$48 to 49.99	12
24 to 25.99	24	50 to 51.99	11
26 to 27.99	23	52 to 53.99	10
28 to 29.99	22	54 to 55.99	9
30 to 31.99	21	56 to 57.99	8
32 to 33.99	20	58 to 59.99	7
34 to 35.99	19	60 to 61.99	6
36 to 37.99	18	62 to 63.99	5
38 to 39.99	17	64 to 65.99	4
40 to 41.99	16	66 to 67.99	3
42 to 43.99	15	68 to 69.99	2
44 to 45.99	14	70 to 71.99	1
46 to 47.99	13	72 and over	0

In a few instances, expenditure ranges or rank orders were further differentiated by academic program levels such as the following example taken from the Oklahoma State Plan (Pg. 4).

Relative priorities of laboratory and other special equipment projects will be determined as follows:

The average of the basic educational and general expenditures per semester credit hour equivalent, at the institution or branch campus for which the project is submitted, for the three completed institutional fiscal years (or for the completed years if less than three) immediately preceding the closing date for which the application is filed with the State Commission. Possible score of 25 points assigned as follows:

Universities

(Institutions offering an approved doctoral program in one or more fields).

Expenditures	Points
$30.00 or less per S.C.H.	25 pts.
$30.01 to $33.00 per S.C.H.	20 pts.
$33.01 to $36.00 per S.C.H.	15 pts.
$36.01 to $39.00 per S.C.H.	10 pts.
$39.01 to $42.00 per S.C.H.	5 pts.
$42.01 or higher	0 pts.

Four-Year Colleges

(Institutions offering a bachelor's degree but less than a doctor's degree).

Expenditures	Points
$22.00 or less per S.C.H.	25 pts.
$22.01 to $25.00 per S.C.H.	20 pts.
$25.01 to $28.00 per S.C.H.	15 pts.
$28.01 to $31.00 per S.C.H.	10 pts.
$31.01 to $34.00 per S.C.H.	5 pts.
$34.01 or higher	0 pts.

2. Some differentiation among institutions according to Equipment and Materials Used in Existing Space was required. Some states established definite percentage ranges within which a set number of points would be awarded such as the Illinois State Plan (Pg. 5).

The percentage of the total equipment and materials budget which is for equipment and materials to be placed and used in existing classrooms or audiovisual centers as such terms are defined in Part 171, Chapter I, Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations. For purposes of this criterion "existing" classrooms or audiovisual centers are those which were in use as of the first fall term immediately preceding the closing date for which the application is filed and which are not to be renovated or rehabilitated during the current year. Priority advantage will be given to high percentages. Applications will receive priority according to the following scale.

Possible Score — 20 Priority Points

	Priority Points
100%	20
90 - 99.9%	18
80 - 89.9%	16
70 - 79.9%	14
60 - 69.9%	12
50 - 59.9%	10
40 - 49.9%	8
30 - 39.9%	6
20 - 29.9%	4
10 - 19.9%	2
0 - 9.9%	0 Priority Points

Other states utilized a more variable scale such as found in the New Hampshire State Plan (Pg. 4).

Whether or not the equipment and materials to be purchased under the project are to be used in: (1) existing classrooms or audiovisual centers, or (2) classrooms or audiovisual centers to be made available by new construction and/or major rehabilitation or conversion of existing facilities. Possible score of twenty (20) points assigned

by multiplying the percentage of the total equipment and materials budget for the project which is for items to be placed in existing classrooms or audio-visual centers times 20 points.

Many states responded editorially questioning the value of this criteria. It is apparent that this criteria does not provide a "cutting edge". If the original purpose for which this criteria was established still exists it seems that some administrative redirection is required.

3. Some differentiation among institutions according to Capacity/Enrollment Ratio was required. Some states established definite ranges with priority points prescribed within each range. The following example was taken from the Florida State Plan (Pg. 6).

> Capacity/enrollment ratio at the institution or branch campus for which the project is submitted as of the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed.

ASSOCIATE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Capacity/Enrollment Ratio	POINTS Established Institutions	POINTS New Institutions
up through 100.0	10	Automatic 6
100.1 - 150.0	9	
150.1 - 200.0	8	
200.1 - 225.0	7	
225.1 - 250.0	6	
250.1 - 275.0	5	
275.1 - 300.0	4	
300.1 - 325.0	3	
325.1 - 350.0	2	
350.1 and up	1	

BACCALAUREATE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Capacity/Enrollment Ratio	POINTS Established Institutions	POINTS New Institutions
up through 130.0	10	Automatic 6
130.1 - 210.0	9	
210.1 - 270.0	8	
270.1 - 300.0	7	
300.1 - 330.0	6	
330.1 - 360.0	5	
360.1 - 400.0	4	
400.1 - 440.0	3	
440.1 - 480.0	2	
480.1 and up	1	

Some states have awarded priority points based upon a rank order system stated in percentage terms as in the following example taken from the Missouri State Plan (Pg. 2).

> The capacity/enrollment ratio at the institution or branch campus for which the project is submitted, as of the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed with priority advantage given to the lower ratios.
>
> | | | |
> |---|---|---|
> | First | 25 percent | - 10 points |
> | Second | 25 percent | - 6 2/3 " |
> | Third | 25 percent | - 3 1/3 " |
> | Fourth | 25 percent | - 0 " |

While a similar system stated in terms of quintile rank was employed by the New Hampshire State Plan (Pg. 4).

> Capacity/enrollment ratio at the institution or branch campus for which the project is submitted as of the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed. Possible score of 10 points assigned as follows:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | 1st quintile | 10 points |
> | 2nd quintile | 8 points |
> | 3rd quintile | 6 points |
> | 4th quintile | 4 points |
> | 5th quintile | 0 points |

The rationale for the inclusion of this standard was questioned by some respondents.

4. Some differentiation among institutions according to Students to be Served and New Course Offerings were required for Category II applications. A percentile or decile system was employed by several states as evidenced by the New York State Plan (Pg. 13) as follows:

> The ability of the applicant to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the projected number of additional student enrollments in undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution, branch campus or combination of institutions as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed. A possible score of ten (10) points will be assigned as follows:

Rank order placement in upper 10%	10 points
Rank order placement in second highest 10%	9 "
Rank order placement in third highest 10%	8 "
Rank order placement in fourth highest 10%	7 "
Rank order placement in fifth highest 10%	6 "
Rank order placement in sixth highest 10%	5 "
Rank order placement in seventh highest 10%	4 "
Rank order placement in eighth highest 10%	3 "
Rank order placement in ninth highest 10%	2 "
Rank order placement in lowest 10%	1 point

In applications submitted by a combination of institutions, the combined figures reported under this item must represent the total projected number of additional student enrollments in undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at all participating institutions. These figures must be supported by separate exhibits for each institution and must be attached to the application.

A slight variation of this type of system is a simple rank order plan as shown by the Florida State Plan (Pg. 9).

Effective utilization of educational television as evidenced by the projected number of additional student enrollments in undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution or branch campus covered by the projects as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed.

Projected Enrollment Increase	Points
Largest Projected Enrollment Increase	10
2nd " " " "	9
3rd " " " "	8
4th " " " "	7
5th " " " "	6
6th " " " "	5
7th " " " "	4
8th " " " "	3
9th " " " "	2
All Other Applicants	1

Still another variation was to assign priority points for established numbers of students to be served as illustrated in the Alaska State Plan (Pgs. 6 and 7).

The effective utilization of the equipment in the proposed project as evidenced by the projected number of additional student enrollments in undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution or branch campus covered by the project as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed.

Possible score of 20 points assigned as follows:

500 or more	20 points
450 - 499	18
400 - 449	16
350 - 399	14
300 - 349	12
250 - 299	10
200 - 249	8
150 - 199	6
100 - 149	4
50 - 99	2
Less than 50	0

Among the various techniques for determining New Course Offerings, a percentile rank was often employed as in the example taken from the North Carolina State Plan (Pg. 10).

Fifteen (15) points maximum shall be assigned to projects on the basis of the ability of the applicant to utilize educational television effectively as evidenced by the number of planned additional undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution or branch campus covered by the project as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed (with higher priority value awarded for a greater number of additional courses to be programmed). As used in this criterion, "course" means a particular course offering (such as"English I") rather than an individual section of the same course. Points shall be assigned according to the ranks indicated in the following table:

Number of Additional Courses to be Programmed

Percentile Rank*	Points
84 - 99	15
67 - 83	12

(cont'd)

51 - 66	9
34 - 50	6
17 - 33	3
1 - 16	0

*Among all projects being considered.

Some states employed a priority system based upon an established scale of additional courses such as found on Pages 7 and 8 of the Colorado State Plan.

> The ability of the applicant to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the number of planned additional undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution or branch campus covered by the project as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed (with higher priority value awarded for the greater number of additional courses to be programmed). As used here "course" means a particular course offering (such as English 10) rather than an individual section of the same course.
>
> Points will be assigned according to the following table of additional courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction.
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | 7 or more additional courses | 20 points |
> | 5 or 6 additional courses | 15 points |
> | 3 or 4 additional courses | 10 points |
> | 1 or 2 additional courses | 5 points |

Some states awarded priority points on the basis of a rank order system such as the Georgia State Plan (Pgs. 7 and 8).

> Points will be awarded on the basis of the applicants' ability to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the number of planned additional undergraduate level courses which are to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution or branch campus covered by the project as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application was filed. By "course" is meant a particular course offering such as "English I" rather than an individual section of the same course.

Grant applications will be ranked in order with the largest number of additional courses being ranked number one, the next largest number two, and continuing thusly. The number one ranked application will be awarded 30 points, the number two ranked application will receive 28 points, and continuing thusly dropping two points for each drop in ranking. Should more than 15 applications be received all applications ranking in excess of 15 shall be awarded zero points.

Some variations include a distinction between New and Established institutions such as noted in the Arkansas State Plan (Pg. 9).

The ability of the applicant to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the number of planned additional undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed. As used here, "course" means a particular course offering (such as English I) rather than an individual section of the same course.

Points Will Be Assigned As Follows:

Rank Order Placement	Established Institutions Points	New Institutions Points
Highest or 1st quintile	20	30
Second highest or 2nd quintile	16	25
Third highest or 3rd quintile	12	20
Fourth highest or 4th quintile	8	15
Fifth highest or 5th quintile	4	10

B. Other Priority Factors

In addition to prescribed criteria, flexibility was provided to allow states to include other priority factors which could strengthen the administration of the Title VI-A program as directed by the individual state needs. Those factors may be of considerable interest to the Association, as many states expressed an interest in revising their State Plans.

1. Limitation of Grant Funds - several states have imposed a grant limitation lower than the maximum allowed by the federal regulations. The following example of funds limitations for Category I was taken from the Tennessee State Plan (Pg. 11).

> The State Commission will determine federal shares for projects which appear to be eligible for funds allotted under Part A of Title VI of the Act, by application of the following standards and methods:
>
> Federal shares for laboratory and other special equipment (CategoryI) projects for any fiscal year will be determined as follows:
>
> The Federal share of a project shall be fifty percent of the costs eligible or ten percent of the Tennessee allocation for the fiscal year, whichever is lesser.
>
> If, as of a particular closing date, the Federal funds available for laboratory and other special equipment projects and/or closed circuit instructional television projects are not exhausted by application of Paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2, the excess funds for each category shall be distributed among those projects, in order of relative priority, which did not receive fifty percent of the costs eligible for Federal financial participation. The distribution to each such project shall be an amount sufficient to increase the federal share to a share equal to fifty percent of the costs eligible for Federal financial participation.

Kansas attempted to treat limitation of funds with the following standard taken from Page 7 of the State Plan.

> The Federal share amount requested divided by the Full-Time Equivalent undergraduate enrollment

at the campus to be served by the project, as of the fall semester immediately preceding the date of application. Priority points shall be assigned as follows:

Up to $4.00	10 points
$4.01 to 4.25	9 "
4.26 to 4.50	8 "
4.51 to 4.75	7 "
4.76 to 5.00	6 "
5.01 to 5.25	5 "
5.26 to 5.50	4 "
5.51 to 5.75	3 "
5.76 to 6.00	2 "
6.01 and more	1 "

2. Grant History - Many states had a provision which awarded priority points to institutions not receiving prior grants. A typical example is taken from the North Carolina State Plan for Category II (Pg. 13).

Five (5) points maximum shall be assigned on the basis of the amount and recency of previous grants under Category II in accordance with the following table:

Amount and Recency of Previous Grants	Points
1. No previous Category II grant.	5
2. Cumulative Category II grants of less than $15,000 in the two (2) preceding fiscal years.	3
3. Cumulative Category II grants of $15,000 to $30,000 during the preceding two (2) fiscal years.	1
4. Cumulative Category II grants of more than $30,000 in the two (2) preceding fiscal years.	0

South Dakota also established a ratio between grant history and FTE as shown on Pages 5 and 6 of the State Plan for Category I and Page 9 for Category II.

The ratio that the amount of all previous grants for laboratory and special equipment projects awarded to the institution or branch campus bears to the full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment at the institution or branch campus as of the fall term immediately preceding the closing date for which the application is filed.

Possible score of 20 points assigned as follows:

Ratio	Points
0 to 2.99	20
3.0 to 5.99	18
6.0 to 8.99	16
9.0 to 11.99	14
12.0 to 14.99	12
15.0 to 17.99	10
18.0 to 20.99	8
21.0 to 23.99	6
24.0 to 26.99	4
27.0 to 29.99	2
30.0 and over	0

Texas employed a standard which penalized applicants for failing to fully utilize previously recommended grant funds.

Florida awards priority points to applicants having previously submitted a project which was not recommended due to insufficient grant funds available through the state allotment as shown in the example taken from the State Plan (Pg. 10).

> Was a grant request for closed-circuit instructional television filed at the preceding closing date, accepted, and not funded because available funds were exhausted?
>
> | Acceptable Project, Preceding Closing Date | Points |
> |---|---|
> | Yes | 10 |
> | No | 0 |

3. Cooperative Projects - Some states awarded priority points for inter-institutional projects as evidenced by the Illinois State Plan (Pgs. 10 and 11).

> The ability of the applicant to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the inclusion of its closed-circuit instructional television project in a formally organized and administered program undertaken by two (2) or more institutions of higher education (as such term is defined in Section 801 (a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction through the use of shared closed-circuit instructional television equipment, materials, and services.
>
> A project which is included in such a program shall be awarded priority points on the basis of the total number of participants in such program.

For purposes of this criterion, "participants" refers to institutions of higher education.

Possible score	5 priority points
Program involving two participants	3 priority points
Program involving three participants	4 priority points
Program involving more than three participants	5 priority points

The ability of the applicant to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the inclusion of its closed-circuit instructional television project in a formally organized and administered program undertaken by more than one institution of higher education and/or branch campus (as such terms are defined in Section 801(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and in Part 171, Chapter I, Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations) to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction through the use of shared closed-circuit instructional television equipment, materials, and services. A project which is included in such a program shall be awarded priority points on the basis of the total number of participants in such programs.

For purposes of this criterion, "participants" refers to institutions of higher education and/or branch campuses.

Possible score	5 priority points
Program involving two participants	3 priority points
Program involving three participants	4 priority points
Program involving more than three participants	5 priority points

4. Justification of Need - Some states awarded priority points for all or parts of the required narrative description of the project. The New York example is one of the most comprehensive treatments of this concern.

-50-

Deficiencies to be Remedied. Ten points will be awarded for a statement defining and identifying weaknesses, deficiencies, and gaps in the program that will be remedied by this project. Where possible this statement should be supported by:

(1) Reports from consultants, faculty, and students.

(2) Comparison with national norms.

(3) Impact of deficiencies on areas such as enrollment, staff, and space.

Zero points will be awarded if the statement is not included or if the information offered in support of this statement is not judgee to be adequate.

Plan for Improvement. Ten points will be awarded for a clear but detailed statement on the basic instruction. This statement should be substantiated by the following:

(1) Specific information on how and where the proposed equipment and materials will be used to remedy the deficiencies in section (f).

(2) Objective indicators for the probable success of this project to improve undergraduate instruction. Where possible, results of previous research or experience (at the same campus or elsewhere) should be used.

(3) Qualifications of all personnel directly involved in the administration and implementation of this project.

Zero points will be awarded if the statement is not included or if the information offered to substantiate this statement is not judged to be adequate.

Faculty Involvement in Planning. Five points will be awarded for a clear, concise statement regarding the degree of faculty involvement in identifying needs and shortcomings, in planning the improvements described, and in identifying needed equipment and materials.

Zero points will be awarded if the statement is not included or if the degree of faculty involvement is not judged to be adequate.

Faculty Development Plan. Five points will be awarded for a statement describing plans for upgrading faculty understanding and competence in effective utilization of the instructional equipment and materials requested in this application. Specific references should be made to the instructors, participants, content, and duration of in-service training sessions scheduled for this purpose.

Zero points will be awarded if the statement is not included or if provisions for in-service training are not judged to be adequate.

Equipment Inventory and Service Policy. Five points will be awarded for a statement detailing the applicant's current inventory, if any, of equipment and materials similar to those proposed, and a statement of the applicant's policy for servicing or otherwise properly maintaining the items requested. (Multi-institutional applications should include separate inventories for similar items and a single policy on service for items proposed herein.)

Evaluation of the Project. Five points will be awarded for a comprehensive statement indicating procedures to be used for continuous evaluation of the project to increase its effectiveness for the improvement of undergraduate instruction.

Zero points will be awarded if the statement is not included or if the evaluation procedures described are not judged to be adequate.

5. Academic Areas - Some states gave higher priority to particular subject areas based upon individual state needs. The following two standards taken from Page 7 of the Pennsylvania State Plan are illustrative of both institutional and state concerns.

Priority consideration shall be given to an institution or branch campus which, with the approval of its board of trustees, has committed itself to the establishment of an improved specialized program or curricular offering. If such a commitment has been established by the applicant, an exhibit shall be attached to the application form setting forth, in detail, the nature of such program or curricular offering, and outlining the extent to which undergraduate instruction will be improved by its implementation. Possible score of 10 points assigned as follows:

Commitment established and exhibit attached - 10 points

No commitment established
0 points.

Priority consideration shall be given to a project application which demonstrates the extent to which the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment will be designated for use in the subject areas listed for this criterion. The factor shall be measured by the percent of the total budget for equipment earmarked for use in the following subject areas:

Campus-wide general use	10 x % of budget
Other humanities area	8 x % of budget
The Arts area	6 x % of budget
The Social Science area	4 x % of budget
Any other single subject area	2 x % of budget

The total scores achieved under each of the subject areas listed above, shall be added together and ranked in priority from highest to lowest. Maximum score of 10 points, assigned by decile placement.

*Institutions or branch campuses not in operation for at least one (1) academic year preceding the academic year in which the application is filed shall receive five (5) points on this standard.

6. Net Educational Assets - New Hampshire gave higher priority to projects received from institutions having limited assets per FTE as shown on Page 5 of the State Plan.

The net educational assets of the institution or branch campus as reported on the most recent balance sheet per full-time equivalent student as of the fall semester immediately preceding the date of the application, as an indicator of financial need. Possible score of 5 points assigned as follows:

Lowest quartile	-	5 points
Second lowest quartile	-	3 points
Third lowest quartile	-	2 points
Fourth lowest quartile	-	1 point

7. Support Derived From Student Tuition and Fees - Mississippi gave higher priority to institutions receiving greater budgetary support from students tuition and fee as shown on Page 5 of that State Plan.

Twenty-five points shall be based on the highest ratio of support of the educational and general expenditure per semester credit hour equivalent

derived from student tuition and fees, for the full academic year immediately preceding the year in which the application for a grant is filed. The following scale of points shall operate; except that an institution not in operation one academic year would be awarded 15 points:

The institution having the highest ratio of student support per SCHE	25 points
The institution having the second highest	23 points
The institution having the third highest	20 points
The institution having the fourth highest	18 points
The institution having the fifth highest	16 points
The institution having the sixth highest	10 points
The institutions having less than the sixth highest, but more than a ratio of 25%	5 points
All other institutions	0 points

Ties shall share alike the average of the sum of the points of the involved positions.

8. Credit Hour Production - Maryland gave priority to institutions producing greater undergraduate credit hours as evidenced on Page 9 of that State Plan.

The total number of undergraduate semester hours of work carried by all students as of the fall term preceding the date of application.

The semester hours shall be weighted as follows:

The two year colleges shall multiply the total semester hours by two (2).
The colleges with undergraduate programs only, shall multiply the total semester hours by one and one-half (1 1/2).
The colleges with both undergraduate and graduate programs shall multiply the total semester hours by one (1).

Possible score of 40 points assigned by inverse rank order of all projects under consideration.

Placement in highest	25% - 40 points
" " second highest	25% - 30 points
" " third highest	25% - 20 points
" " lowest	25% - 10 points

9. Average Faculty Salary - South Carolina gave priority to those institutions providing lowest average faculty salaries as seen on Page 5 of the State Plan.

The overall financial ability of the applicant institution as evidenced by the average faculty salary of full time faculty members in South Carolina colleges on a nine or ten month contract in the latest year for which the annual report on faculty salaries is available from the American Association of University Professors.

Possible Score of 10 Points, assigned as follows:

	Lowest quintile	10 points
Next	" "	8 points
"	" "	6 points
"	" "	4 points
"	" "	2 points

Oklahoma gave priority to institutions providing highest average faculty salaries.

The average percentage of the basic educational and general expenditures for Teaching Salaries (as defined in College and University Business Administration, Vol., I, American Council on Education: 1952) for the three preceding institutional fiscal years or for the completed years if less than three. (If an institution has not completed one fiscal year of operation, see Section 7.5.) Possible score of 10 points assigned as follows:

50% or higher	10 points
49.0% to 49.9%	9 points
48.0% to 48.9%	8 points
47.0% to 47.9%	7 points
46.0% to 46.9%	6 points
45.0% to 45.9%	5 points
44.0% to 44.9%	4 points
43.0% to 43.9%	3 points
42.0% to 42.9%	2 points
41.0% to 41.9%	1 point
Below 41.0%	0 points

10. Library Expenditures - Oklahoma provided priority to institutions budgeting higher percentages for acquisitions as seen on Page 6 of the State Plan.

The average percentage of the basic educational and general expenditures for Books and Periodicals (as defined in College and University Business Administration, Vol., I, American Council on

Education: 1952) for the three preceding institutional fiscal years or for the completed years if less than three. (If an institution has not completed one fiscal year of operation, see Section 7.5.) Possible score of 10 points assigned as follows:

2.00% or higher	10 points
1.85% to 1.99%	9 points
1.70% to 1.84%	8 points
1.55% to 1.69%	7 points
1.40% to 1.54%	6 points
1.25% to 1.39%	5 points
1.10% to 1.24%	4 points
.95% to 1.09%	3 points
.80% to .94%	2 points
.65% to .79%	1 point
Below .65%	0 points

11. Attrition-Retention Ratio - Missouri gave priority to institutions having higher retention rates as shown on Page 2 of the State Plan.

The sequential or longitudinal ratio between the number of freshmen and sophomores for the last two fall terms preceding the date of application as shown in the annual reports to the Commission on Higher Education with the highest priority going to the institution with the best retention rate.

First	25 percent	-	10	points
Second	25 percent	-	6 2/3	points
Third	25 percent	-	3 1/3	points
Fourth	25 percent	-	0	points

12. Degrees Awarded - Missouri gives higher priority to institutions awarding larger numbers of undergraduate degrees as illustrated on Page 2 of the State Plan.

The number of degrees awarded (all regular degrees and diplomas at or below the four year level) for the previous academic year as shown in reports to the Commission on Higher Education in proportion to the total FTE fall undergraduate enrollment for the same academic year, with the highest priority going to the highest ratio.

First	25 percent	-	10	points
Second	25 percent	-	6 2/3	points
Third	25 percent	-	3 1/3	points
Fourth	25 percent	-	0	points

13. Utilization - Several states awarded priority for institutional classroom and laboratory utilization apart from the Capacity/ Enrollment ratio requirement. A typical example is taken from the Louisiana State Plan (Pg. 5a).

> Average weekly room period use for general classrooms for the institution or branch campus for which the application is submitted for the fall term preceding the closing date for which the application is filed. (Note: These data are subject to verification by the facilities and utilization study conducted by the Higher Education Facilities Commissions.)

Average weekly room period use: General Classrooms (Room Use Code 110)	Points
30.1 hours or more	10
27.1 - 30.0 hours	8
24.1 - 27.0 hours	6
21.1 - 24.0 hours	4
18.1 - 21.0 hours	2
18.0 hours or less	0

> Average weekly room period use for instructional laboratories for the institution or branch campus for which the application is submitted for the fall term preceding the closing date for which the application is filed. (Note: These data are subject to verification by the facilities and utilization study conducted by the Higher Education Facilities Commission.)

Average weekly room period use: Laboratories (Room Use Code 210 and 220)	Points
20.1 hours or more	10
18.1 - 20.0 hours	8
16.1 - 18.0 hours	6
14.1 - 16.0 hours	4
12.1 - 14.0 hours	2
12.0 hours or less	0

14. Class Size - Missouri gave priority to institutions with higher average class size as shown on Page 2 of the State Plan.

> The average size of all credit undergraduate sections (not including independent study) for the fall term immediately preceding date of application. (Term need not have been completed).

30 or more	-	10	points
20 - 29	-	6 2/3	"
15 - 19	-	3 1/3	"
14 or below	-	0	"

15. Federal Support - Colorado awards priority to institutions receiving the lower levels of federal support as illustrated on Page 6 of the State Plan.

Support received by the applicant institution from federal agencies for projects relating to undergraduate instruction. Including support for undergraduate equipment, research participation, and the like but not including contract or grant research or support for graduate research and facilities, will be considered, with priority advantage given to applications submitted by institutions that have received relatively less federal assistance.

Institutions will report on a special Commission form the source, nature, and amount of grants received during the completed fiscal year immediately preceding the closing date for which the application is submitted. The dollar total of these grants will be divided by the number of FTE undergraduate students enrolled in the Fall term during that same fiscal year. Applications will be ranked, from lowest dollar average per FTE student to highest. Points will be awarded as follows:

Lowest support (including zero support)	20 points
Second lowest support	17 points
Third lowest support	14 points
Fourth lowest support	11 points
Fifth lowest support	8 points
Sixth lowest support	5 points
Seventh lowest support	2 points
All Others	0 points

16. Lower Division Instruction - Colorado provided priority for projects directed to improvement of lower division instruction as indicated on Page 6 of the State Plan.

Projects directed toward improvement of instruction in lower division courses (courses offered for freshmen and/or sophomores) will receive (junior and/or senior-level) instruction.

Projects including equipment/materials only 15 points
courses at freshman and/or sophomore levels

Projects including equipment/materials for courses at both freshman-sophomore and junior-senior levels — 10 points

Projects including equipment/materials for courses at junior and/or senior levels — 5 points

17. Age of Academic Programs - Colorado gave priority to projects for new instructional programs as seen on Page 7 of the State Plan.

Projects for equipment and materials for academic programs that have been in existence in the applicant institution for less than five years from the date immediately preceding the closing date for which the application is submitted, will receive priority advantage, except that projects for facilities to be made available by new construction or major rehabilitation or conversion of existing facilities (standard 7.1 (b)) will not be eligible for priority advantage under this standard. "Academic program" shall mean any organized series of courses or other academic requirements constituting a "major" or "concentration" or "emphasis" that is administered as such, through assignment to specific academic officer(s). It is intended that programs of any institution that has been in existence for less than five years would receive advantage in accordance with the provisions of this standard.

Projects for programs in existence less than 5 years — 10 points

Projects for programs in existence five years or more — 5 points

18. Faculty Load - Florida gave priority to institutions having high average teaching loads as shown on Page 4a of the State Plan.

Average teaching load of full-time faculty members (full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors) employed on a nine- or ten-month contract in the institutional fiscal year immediately preceding the fiscal year in which the application is filed. Do not include in this calculation any teaching assignment during the summer session.

	Points
More than 14.0 hours per week	5
12.1 - 14.0 hours per week	4
10.1 - 12.0 hours per week	3
8.1 - 10.0 hours per week	2
6.1 - 8.0 hours per week	1
6.0 hours or less per week	0

19. Undergraduate Faculty - Florida gave high priority to institutions with a larger percentage of undergraduate faculty as illustrated on Page 7 of the State Plan.

Percentage of faculty members teaching nine (9) semester credit hour equivalents or more in undergraduate courses as of the fall term immediately preceding the closing date.

ASSOCIATE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Percentage	POINTS Established Institutions	POINTS New Institutions
94.1 and up	10	Automatic 6
90.1 - 94.0	9	
86.1 - 90.0	8	
82.1 - 86.0	7	
78.1 - 82.0	6	
74.1 - 78.0	5	
70.1 - 74.0	4	
66.1 - 70.0	3	
62.1 - 66.0	2	
up through 62.0	1	

BACCALAUREATE DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Percentage	POINTS Established Institutions	POINTS New Institutions
90.1 and up	10	Automatic 6
85.1 - 90.0	9	
80.1 - 85.0	8	
75.1 - 80.0	7	
70.1 - 75.0	6	
65.1 - 70.0	5	
60.1 - 65.0	4	
55.1 - 60.0	3	
50.1 - 55.0	2	
up through 50.0	1	

20. Student-Faculty Ratio - Florida gave high priority for high student-faculty ratios as depicted on Page 8 a of the State Plan.

Full-time equivalent student/faculty ratio at the institution or branch campus as of the fall term preceding the closing date.

Faculty/Student Ratio	Established Institutions	New Institutions

(cont'd)

(cont'd)

25.1 and up	10	Automatic 5
23.1 - 25.0	9	
21.1 - 23.0	8	
20.1 - 21.0	7	
19.6 - 20.0	6	
19.1 - 19.5	5	
18.1 - 19.0	4	
17.1 - 18.0	3	
16.1 - 17.0	2	
up through 16.0	1	

21. Independent Study - Pennsylvania awarded high priority to projects encouraging independent study as depicted on Pages 6 and 7 of the State Plan.

The percentage of the total undergraduate enrollment, as of the first full completed term immediately preceding the date of application, which was responsibly engaged in specialized independent study or research projects. Specialized independent study or research projects may be defined as any specialized independent study or research which is supervised academic activity provided within the requirements of the curricular offerings of the applicant. Data to be used in computing the score for this criterion shall be submitted as supplemental information and attached, as an Exhibit to the application. Maximum score of 10 points assigned by decile placement.

Decile	Points
1st decile	10 points
2nd decile	9 points
3rd decile	8 points
4th decile	7 points
5th decile	6 points
6th decile	5 points
7th decile	4 points
8th decile	3 points
9th decile	2 points
10th decile	1 point

22. Educational Innovation - The Texas State Plan encourages innovation in instructional technique.

23. Consumer - Several states treated the question of primary use of the equipment and materials. One of the most comprehensive treatments is taken from Page 6 of the Pennsylvania State Plan.

The total percents of costs of laboratory and other special equipment to be provided by the project,

which will be used primarily by:

(1) Undergraduate students performing required or elective work in the curricular offerings of the applicant. Percentage multiplied by four.

(2) Undergraduate students performing specialized and/or independent research in subject areas related to the curricular offerings of the applicant. Percentage multiplied by three.

(3) Instructors performing their required duties using equipment to be acquired by the project in direct instruction of undergraduate students participating in the curricular offerings of the applicant. Percentage multiplied by two.

(4) Instructors performing specialized and/or independent research in subject areas related to their own interest or the curricular offerings of the applicant. Percentage multiplied by one.

Date to be used in computing the score for this criterion shall be submitted as supplemental information and attached as an exhibit related to parts D and F of the application form. The total scores achieved under subparagraphs (i) through (iv) inclusive of this section, shall be added together and ranked in priority from highest to lowest. Maximum score of 10 points, assigned by decile placement

Decile	Points
1st decile	10 points
2nd decile	9 points
3rd decile	8 points
4th decile	7 points
5th decile	6 points
6th decile	5 points
7th decile	4 points
8th decile	3 points
9th decile	2 points
10th decile	1 point

24. Ability to Effectively Utilize Educational Television - Several states included a number of standards to treat this concern. While approached in a variety of criteria, most of the concerns are expressed by the following criteria taken from the New York State Plan (Pgs. 13, 14, 15, and 16).

More than twelve (12) additional courses	15 points
Ten (10) to twelve (12) additional courses	12 points
Seven (7) to nine (9) additional courses	9 points
Four (4) to six (6) additional courses	6 points
One (1) to three (3) additional courses	3 points
No additional courses	0 points

In applications submitted by a combination of institutions, the combined figures reported under this item must represent the total number of planned additional undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at all participating institutions. These figures must be supported by separate exhibits for each institution and must be attached to the application.

The ability of the applicant to effectively utilize educational television as evidenced by the projected number of additional student enrollments in undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at the institution, branch campus or combination of institutions as of the opening of the second fall term after the fall term which opened preceding the closing date for which the application is filed. A possible score of ten (10) points will be assigned as follows:

Rank order placement in upper 10%	10 points
Rank order placement in second highest 10%	9 points
Rank order placement in third highest 10%	8 points
Rank order placement in fourth highest 10%	7 points
Rank order placement in fifth highest 10%	6 points
Rank order placement in sixth highest 10%	5 points
Rank order placement in seventh highest 10%	4 points
Rank order placement in eighth highest 10%	3 points
Rank order placement in ninth highest 10%	2 points
Rank order placement in lowest 10%	1 point

In applications submitted by a combination of institutions, the combined figures reported under this item must represent the total projected number of additional student enrollments in undergraduate level courses to be programmed for closed-circuit instruction at all participating institutions. These figures must be supported by separate exhibits for each institution and must be attached to the application.

Preface to State Commission Criteria: Category II

State Commission staff members award points under Federal criteria (a), (b), and (c). The awarding of

points under State criteria (e) and (f) will be made by a panel of experts selected by the State Education Department and acceptable by the Federal Office of Education. The panel will award the total points in each section they are designated to evaluate if satisfactory evidence is presented, or zero points if the evidence is not presented or is insufficient to substantiate the stated plan.

25. Pre-file Deadline - The District of Columbia encourages contact with the State Commission prior to the closing date.

C. REVISION OF TITLE VI-A STATE PLANS

Review of responses demonstrates that few major revisions of Title VI-A State Plans have occured since 1966. Most revisions have been of a general housekeeping nature such as changing closing dates or provisions to limit federal share amounts in response to funding levels. Efforts by the Association toward major revision of the Title VI-A program and subsequent State Plan changes have been seriously hampered by the annual questionable status of this program.

D. PROPOSED TITLE VI-A STATE PLAN REVISIONS

In addition to federal requirement revisions, several states have indicated a need to revise the optional criteria in their State Plans. Many of these proposed criteria already have been incorporated into some existing State Plans and hopefully the membership will explore these experiences.

1. Housekeeping Revisions - (a) Reorganization of State Commission. Some states are involved in a general reorganization of state government which alters the status of the existing Commission and necessitates some State Plan change. (b) Clarity - Some states have expressed a need to make their State Plan more readable. (c) An interest exists to provide for a self-scoring feature.

2. Smaller Initial Funding Limitations - This feature exists in some State Plans and most states are considering such a provision.

3. Federal Share Reductions - One state proposes to reduce the eligible federal share amount.

4. Grant History - Many states have this feature and others plan to adopt such a provision.

5. Enrollment Increase - Some states have such a standard and others are considering its addition.

6. Disadvantaged Students - Some states have proposed a criteria similar to the required criteria for Title I applications.

7. Veterans - Some states have proposed a criteria similar to the required criteria for Title I applications.

8. Encourage CCTV Applications - One state hopes to increase the attractiveness of its Category II program.

9. Relative Points - Many states are planning to make adjustments in the relative weights of various optional and required criteria. Adjustment of the relative weights of existing criteria may be the most significant of all State Plan revisions. The potential latitude for optional state criteria is sufficient to redirect the philosophy of a State Plan.

Two specific weight adjustments proposed would serve to:

1. Aid financially disadvantaged institutions.

2. Provide some balance between two-year and four-year institutions.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

SELF-STUDY - HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES COMMISSIONS

The Committee on Administration and State Plans as a task force of the National Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education Facilities Commissions has accepted during the current fiscal year the responsibility of providing mechanisms or source documents for member agencies to consider as part of each agency's year to year introspective search. Fully recognizing the varied nature of the agencies and orientation of staffs, the Committee proceeded in an attempt to develop documents that would (1) facilitate exchange of administrative ideas or techniques and (2) possibly help individual agencies as they search for improved service approaches.

In order to fulfill these purposes while attempting not to overlap with other committee functions, the following supportive tasks were initiated:

1. General description of functions deemed specifically delegated by federal legislative language and supporting regulations.

2. Development of a calendar of deadlines and generally key periods for certain portions of agency responsibility.

3. Development of a questionnaire to be sent to all Facilities Commissions to secure status overview and a summary of unique administrative ideas and techniques that could possibly serve other states.

Other general responsibilities accepted by the Committee on Administration and State Plans included seeking imput in development of regulations and a look at the patterns being developed to serve the new clearinghouse requirement.

TO: ALL STATE FACILITIES COMMISSIONS

Part I of the questionnaire represents an attempt by the Committee on Administration and State Plans to briefly describe the operational framework of the various state facilities commissions. Parts II and III of the questionnaire were delimited to administration of and state plans for Title I and Title VI-A. The Committee did recognize that the execution of state plans was not inclusive of all administrative responsibilities. However, the origin of the state facilities commission concept which delegated priority determinations to states seemed to support the notion that state plan execution is the most important common professional responsibility.

Please complete this questionnaire as quickly as possible and forward:

1. A copy of your state's Title I plan,
2. A copy of your state's Title VI-A plan,
3. and the COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE to

Tennessee Higher Education
Facilities Commission

246 Cordell Hull Building

Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Telephone: (615) 741-2955

QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY _____
Name Telephone

_____
Title State Agency

FACILITIES COMMISSIONS: STATUS STUDY

I. STATUS: Please encircle the appropriate answer as to state responsibilities now (3-1-72) solely assigned to your agency.

A. Titles I and III HEFA	yes	no
B. Title VI-A	yes	no
C. Annual Interest Grants	yes	no
D. Comprehensive Planning	yes	no
E. Responsibility for planning other than Federally supported	yes	no
F. Guaranteed Loan Program	yes	no
G. Title I, HEA (community service)	yes	no
H. Is your agency a separate agency for administering Federal programs?	yes	no
I. Do you anticipate any major role change or shift of responsibility within your state during this calendar year?	yes	no

Clarifying comments on any of above (especially E,H,I)

II. TITLE I: STATE PLAN

LIST ANY FEATURES OF YOUR STATE PLAN WHICH YOU FEEL SERVE A SPECIAL STATE PURPOSE OR PRODUCES A PARTICULAR ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECT. (Examples of purposes or effects could be: diminishes importance of ill-chosen regulatory language, supports a particular state policy or need, gives certain types of institutions a better chance, etc.) Give a general description of each feature and specific purpose served. Cite specific location of feature in the State Plan.

A. REQUIRED PRIORITY FACTORS

1. Enrollment Increase

2. Increase in Net Square Footage

3. Utilization

B. OTHER PRIORITY FACTORS

Date of last major plan change _____
Describe briefly on back of page. Please cite purpose or effect sought.

Do you plan any major unrequired change this calendar year? ____
If yes, describe briefly on back of this page. Please cite purpose or effect sought.

III. TITLE VI-A: STATE PLAN

LIST ANY FEATURES OF YOUR STATE PLAN WHICH YOU FEEL SERVE A SPECIAL STATE PURPOSE OR PRODUCES A PARTICULAR ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECT. (Examples of purposes or effects could be: diminishes importance of ill-chosen regulatory language, supports a particular state policy or need, gives certain types of institutions a better chance, etc.) Give a general description of each feature and specific purpose served. Cite specific location of feature in the State Plan.

A. REQUIRED PRIORITY FACTORS

1. Average Basic Educational Expenditure

2. Materials Used in Existing Space

3. Capacity Enrollment Ratio

4. Students to be Served and New Course Offerings

B. OTHER PRIORITY FACTORS

Date of last major plan change _____
Describe briefly on back of page. Please cite purpose or effect sought.

Do you plan any major unrequired change this calendar year? ____
If yes, describe briefly on back of this page. Please cite purpose or effect sought.